



Memorandum

TO: COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC
PLAN TASK FORCE

FROM: Sal Yakubu

**SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON 11/16/04**

DATE: December 3, 2004

Approved

Date

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Mike Tasosa (Valley Transportation Authority), Mike Griffis (County Roads and Airports), Mark Fredrick (Santa Clara County Parks), Bill Shoe (County Planning), Mary Hughes (Silicon Valley Habitat for Humanity), Rebecca Van Dahlen (Santa Clara County Association of Realtors), Barbara Judd (Santa Clara Valley Water District), Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group), Beverley Bryant (Home Builders Association of Northern California), Carolyn McKennan (Morgan Hill Unified School District), Dave Bischoff (City of Morgan Hill), Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group), Michele Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance) and Dunia Noel (LAFCO).

City and Other Public Agency Staff Present:

Salifu Yakubu (PBCE) and Susan Walsh (PBCE).

Consultants and Members of the Public:

Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Eileen Goodwin (APEX Strategies) and Mike Waller (Hexagon).

1. Update: 11/8/04 Task Force Meeting and 10/25/04 Greenbelt Property Owners Meeting:

The meeting convened at 3:00 p.m. with introductions around the room. Susan Walsh, Senior Planner with the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department, provided an update of the 11/8/04 Task Force Meeting and the 10/25/04 Greenbelt Property Owners Meeting. She indicated that the discussion primarily focused on the preliminary design of the Central Green and also included the review of prototypical designs for shared schools and park use. Large and small school strategies were contrasted and explained as well as 5 preliminary workplace strategies.

2. Discussion: Land Use Concepts, Issues Pertaining to the Central Green (Including Schools and Parks), Workplace Alternatives and Mixed Use:

Roger Shanks of the Dahlin Group and Susan Walsh presented a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the land use concepts, issues pertaining to the Central Green (including schools and parks) and the workplace alternatives presented to the Task Force on November 8, 2004.

Eileen of APEX Strategies asked TAC members for their comments and questions and the following were provided:

(a) Schools/Park Concepts

- Concern that the Task Force is still pursuing the single large high school strategy when the Morgan Hill Unified School District (MHUSD) is recommending two smaller high schools. *Roger indicated that the Task Force is still considering the high school design and size and they have asked staff to solicit input from other school administrators on this issue.*
- Will the EIR only consider the large school option? *Sal Yakubu, Principal Planner with the City Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, indicated that this has not been decided yet.*
- The MHUSD reiterated that smaller schools are better for the children education. MHUSD does not support the large school strategy and prefers two smaller high schools.
- Who will assume the liability for joint school/park use? *Sal indicated that there would be joint use agreements that would spell out much of the detail.*
- Is there going to be any cost savings building two-story schools instead of one story? *Roger indicated that Ty Williams, the construction manager for the San Jose Unified School District, indicated that that multi-story construction could reduce construction costs. Eileen recommended that we contact the San Jose Unified School District for more detailed cost information for multi-story construction.*

- Is it common to have two or three story schools in U.S.? *Roger indicated that it is common in mid-west and the east coast mostly because of the weather conditions. Multi-story buildings reduce heating/air-conditioning costs.*

(b) Joint Use Fields:

- How will the public use play areas when school is in session? *Susan indicated that the details of the shared use agreements between the schools and the parks have not been worked out yet. There are many possible shared use concepts that will be explored. Eileen suggested that staff should review a standard school/park agreement.*
- The MHUSD recommended that there be a way to provide exclusive school use during the day to ensure student's safety. *Roger indicated that fencing the whole area is an option. It is also possible to fence the school during school hours, and provide gates that can be opened after hours and on weekends.*
- The public nuisance is another concern. *Eileen suggested that we get a copy of an agreement between school and park.*

(c) Central Green:

- Will there be a safe east/west pedestrian circulation system through Common Green? *Roger indicated that the design currently includes a safe east/west pedestrian circulation system and the conceptual design is still undergoing review.*
- Will the access extend into the west foothills? *Roger indicated that there may be a connection into the west foothills but it has not been decided yet. Sal indicated that the approval of the Cinnabar Golf Course Planned Development required the dedication of an open space easement, which might be of some use in the design of a trail connection.*
- What about the proposed City General Plan amendment for a proposed cemetery? *Sal indicated that the proposal is currently under review but does not involve any trail connections.*
- The County Parks Department recommended that the application for the City General Plan amendment should be referred to the County Parks Department to discuss the possibility of trails. *Susan indicated that they would make the referral to the County Parks Department.*
- Recommend that the school drop off and pick up should be designed so it does not overload the one-way couplet design in the Central Green.
- Recommend that trails connections to the east foothills also be studied.

(d) Workplace & Overall Land Use:

- Due to shallow groundwater depth the location of certain industries may be a challenge (especially the biotechnology industry which depends on water).
- The groundwater is shallower in the north than in the south in some areas. *Staff indicated that the groundwater issue would be explored further.*
- The land use plan still looks too residential in Mid Coyote and industrial in North Coyote (recommend a mixture of residential and industrial in the North and Mid Coyote areas). *Roger indicated that there is a strong effort to maximize the overall mix of jobs and housing in the North and the Mid Coyote areas.*
- How will the Plan ensure that the 50,000 jobs will actually be provided? *Staff indicated that there would be a phasing and implementation strategy to phase the housing and the jobs together. The timing will largely depend on the economy and the market conditions.*
- Concern regarding protection, buffering and setbacks for Coyote Creek Corridor. *Staff indicate that the TAC materials include a letter from the County Parks Department, which recommends wide buffers, and along Coyote Creek Corridor. Design criteria for protection to the creek corridors should be included in the Design Guidelines, which is expected to be developed in the spring of 2005. Sal also indicated that the City's Riparian Corridor Policy requires minimum 100-foot setback along the creek that will most likely be incorporated into the CVSP Design Guidelines.*
- Will the low density residential be built first? *Susan reiterated that there would be a phasing and implementation strategy to phase simultaneous increments of jobs and housing. Roger indicated that there is not a lot of traditional low-density housing planned. The Vision requires a minimum density of 10 DU/AC.*
- Concerned that there are too many jobs in this project.
- Would like to see the concepts are that could facilitate higher density residential development? *Roger stated that the residential and workplace will be phased together. The Phasing and Implementation concepts will be discussed in early 2005.*
- When will retail be discussed? *Roger stated that there would be more discussion of retail land uses at the December 13, 2004 Task Force meeting.*
- What is the timing of for the preparation of the Greenbelt strategy? *Susan stated that the Greenbelt concept on the wall shows some very preliminary ideas, and there will be another Greenbelt Property owner meeting and more discussion regarding the Greenbelt on December 13, 2004.*

- Will the access under Monterey Road be for pedestrians and vehicles? *Roger indicated that circulation is planned for pedestrians and for vehicles.*
- Is Monterey Road connecting to the parkway over the Coyote Creek? *Roger indicated that the Parkway is not planned to connect to Coyote Creek.*

Eileen thanked the TAC for their comments and asked them to identify any other issues that the TAC would like to discuss or issues to be addressed at future TAC meetings. The following comments were provided:

- When will housing type and distribution and affordable housing be discussed? *Susan indicated that we anticipate that the housing strategy will be discussed in early 2005.*
- How are things moving with Traffic model? Mike Waller, of Hexagon, indicated that the results from the VTA traffic model is taking longer than anticipated and may be available by the end of the year.

3. Next Steps:

Susan explained the next steps in the process and encouraged all of the TAC members to attend the next Task Force meeting on November 29, 2004 where there will be a discussion of land use and some revisions to the Composite Framework. She indicated that staff would also be sending out the 2005 TAC meeting schedule soon.

4. Adjourn:

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.